

REMARKS

Reconsideration of the present application is respectfully requested. Claims 1-93 have been canceled. Claims 94-114 have been newly added. No new matter has been added.

Applicant hereby respectfully requests a telephone interview with the Examiner to be held before the Examiner's issuance of an office action in response to this RCE.

Claim Rejections - §112

Claim 92 stands rejected under 35 USC §112, second paragraph, for being indefinite. Particularly, the Examiner alleges that the specification of the present invention does not explicitly mention scanning a file simultaneously for a virus (*see* Final Office Action mailed on 8/16/2006, page 3). Claim 92 has been canceled. Thus, the issue is moot.

The newly added claims include a limitation of “causing each of a plurality of cluster devices that are external to the storage server to execute an operation on the plurality of files simultaneously” (e.g., “requesting a plurality of cluster devices to scan a plurality of files for viruses”). Applicant respectfully submits to the Examiner that this limitation is disclosed in the specification. The Examiner is directed to lines 18-19 on page 19 of the specification of the present invention, where the specification states “[i]n alternative embodiments files may be processed individually by a cluster device 141, by multiple cluster device 141 **simultaneously**, or some combination thereof” (emphasis added). Thus, “causing each of a plurality of cluster devices that are external to the storage server to execute an operation on the plurality of files simultaneously” is explicitly disclosed in the specification.

Claims Rejections - §103(a)

Newly added independent claim 94 recites:

94. A method comprising:
receiving, at a storage server, requests for a plurality of files stored at the storage server, from at least one client of the storage server;
causing, by the storage server, each of a plurality of cluster devices that are external to the storage server to execute an operation on the plurality of files simultaneously;
at the storage server, receiving results of said causing the plurality of cluster devices to execute an operation on the plurality of files simultaneously; and
responding to the requests according to said results.
(Emphasis added).

By contrast, Tso (U.S. Patent no. 6,088,803), Bates I (U.S. Patent no. 6,785,732) and Bates II (U.S. Patent no. 6,721,721), individually or in combination, do not teach or suggest the above emphasized limitation.

Tso discloses a virus checker checking whether a data object to be downloaded to a client device is infected with viruses. Tso, however, does not teach or suggest that the virus checker may be a plurality of cluster devices. Because Tso does not teach or suggest that the virus checker could be a plurality of cluster devices, it certainly does not teach or suggest causing, by the storage server, each of a plurality of cluster devices that are external to the storage server to execute an operation on the plurality of files simultaneously (e.g., requesting a plurality of cluster devices to scan a plurality of files simultaneously for viruses).

Bates I also does not teach or suggest the above emphasized limitation. Bates I discloses a drop-down box for selecting a specific virus scanning application. The drop-down box, however, allows only one virus scanning application to be selected at a time for performing virus checks. The drop-down box does not teach or suggest a plurality of cluster devices for scanning

files. Neither does the rest of Bates I teach or suggest a plurality of cluster devices, certainly not causing, by the storage server, each of a plurality of cluster devices that are external to the storage server to execute an operation on the plurality of files simultaneously.

Bates II also does not teach or suggest the above emphasized limitation. Bates II discloses a method of using multiple computers to scan a plurality of websites to determine whether each of the website is virus free. Based on the scanned results, these multiple computers store the results into a central database accessible by a search engine. In response to a search request, the search engine returns a list of search results (e.g., websites). The search engine also returns virus scanning information regarding each search result to a user so that the user may decide whether to access a particular search result. Scanning multiple websites for viruses is different from scanning a plurality of files stored at a storage server for viruses. The multiple websites and corresponding content thereof are not files stored at a storage server. There is no specific disclosure in Bates II that the websites must be scanned simultaneously by the multiple computers. In addition, as recited in claim 94, the storage server causes each of a plurality of cluster devices that are external to the storage server to execute an operation on the plurality of files simultaneously. Bates II contains no discussion regarding what device causes each of the multiple computers to scan the plurality of websites; it certainly does not teach or suggest such a server which causes the multiple computers to scan the plurality of websites simultaneously. For the above reasons, Bates II does not teach or suggest causing, by the storage server, each of a plurality of cluster devices that are external to the storage server to execute an operation on the plurality of files simultaneously (e.g., requesting a plurality of cluster devices to scan a plurality of files simultaneously for viruses).

At least for the foregoing reasons, claim 94 and all claims which depend on it are patentable over Tso, Bates I and Bates II.

Independent claims 103 and 109 each recites a limitation of requesting a plurality of cluster devices to scan the plurality of files simultaneously for viruses, which is essentially an example of causing, by the storage server, each of a plurality of cluster devices that are external to the storage server to execute an operation on the plurality of files simultaneously. Thus, for similar reasons, claims 103, 109 and all claims which depend on them are patentable over Tso, Bates I and Bates II.


For the foregoing reasons, the present application is believed to be in condition for allowance, and such action is earnestly requested.

If any additional fee is required, please charge Deposit Account No. 02-2666.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP

Date: November 15, 2006


Jordan M. Becker
Reg. No. 39,602

Customer No. 48102
12400 Wilshire Boulevard
Seventh Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90025-1030
(408) 720-8300